

In the Drawings

Applicant submits herewith two new sheets of drawing containing Figures 1 and 2, which illustrate the claimed invention. These drawings are submitted in accordance with the Office's requirement on page 2 of the Office Action and contain pictorial representations of subject matter disclosed and claimed in the application as filed and thus do not constitute new matter.

REMARKS

Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a)

It is hereby requested that the term to respond to the Examiner's Action of June 25, 2009 be extended two months, from September 25, 2009 to November 25, 2009.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the extension fee and any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-4364.

Drawings

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Office has required that applicant submit a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention. Applicant submits herewith two new sheets of drawing containing Figures 1 and 2, which illustrate the claimed invention. These drawings contain pictorial representations of subject matter disclosed and claimed in the application as filed and thus do not constitute new matter.

The §112 Rejection

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has cancelled claim 10, rendering this rejection moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 1-6 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,175 to Chow et al.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 7-9 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088580 to Desai et al. On page 8 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow in view of Desai, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0078292 to Blumenau. On page 9 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow in view of Desai, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0077340 to Forsyth.

The §102(b) Rejection

The Office rejects Claims 1 – 6 and 10 – 12 under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Chow (US patent 6029175).

Claim 1 has been amended to state that the remote computer identifies “automatically without explicit user request any of that viewed content that has been updated and is to be sent to the device”. Support for this can be found in paragraph [0010] of the published application:

“Any kind of content can be identified and automatically sent to and stored at the device in this way without explicit user request;”

This is neither disclosed nor suggested in Chow. In fact, in Chow, the Revision Manager caches:

“only those pages that a client specifically requests to be updated automatically”
at col 4 lines 8 – 10.

Further, all the examples in Chow show a web-based form in which the user has to enter the URL of the document that is to be automatically updated; see for example Fig 5, Fig 6, and

Figs 23 – 29 inclusive.

Chow therefore teaches that the user must specifically identify the web pages that are to be watched for updates. This is quite time consuming for the user. The present invention eliminates the need for the user to do this; by analyzing the content that has been viewed by a device, a remote computer can work out automatically and without any explicit user request, the content updates that should therefore be sent to the device. This is much simpler for a user.

Since independent claim 1 includes limitations not found in Chow, it is submitted that claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom (claims 2-15) are patentable over Chow and are not anticipated by Chow under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In addition, nothing in any of the other prior art of record reasonably suggests the step of analyzing content that has been viewed by a device to work out, automatically and without any explicit user request, the content updates and that should therefore be sent to the user. Hence, no combination of any of the prior art of record with Chow would render the invention obvious.

Applicant notes that in Desai, the web server 202 stores all viewed web pages, and has no knowledge of whether they are updated or not. So a combination of Chow and Desai would be a system in which a web server stores all viewed pages, and the user then defines explicitly which of those viewed pages are to be checked for updates. That is of course very different from the present invention, which removes the need for the user to define explicitly which viewed pages are to be checked for updates.

Independent claim 16 has also been amended to recite

“(b) send that log to a remote computer automatically without any explicit request to watch for updates of specifically identified content, the remote computer being connected to the web server and the device over the wireless network; ...”

Since this is neither taught nor suggested by Chow or any combination of Chow and/or Desai and/or Blumenau, and/or Forsyth, applicant submits that claim 16 is allowable over the prior art.

Conclusion

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the extension fee and any additional fees associated with this communication to applicant's Deposit Account No. 50-4364.

Respectfully submitted

November 25, 2009
Date

/Mark D. Simpson/
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire
Registration No. 32,942

SAUL EWING LLP
Centre Square West
1500 Market Street, 38th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19102-2189
Telephone: 215 972 7880
Facsimile: 215 972 4169
Email: MSimpson@saul.com